UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,814	11/13/2001	Alistair William McLean	1263.1726	6182

5514   7590   01/23/2008
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 November 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _118-142_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _118-142_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 11/16/07.

2.   Claims 118-142 are pending in this application; and, claims 118, 130 and 142 are

independent claims. Claims 1-117 have been cancelled; and, claims 118-121, 123, 130,

131, 133, 135, 136 and 142 have been amended.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Oath/Declaration

4.   The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance

with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is

required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Although it identifies the city and either state or foreign country of residence of
each inventor wherein the residence information may be provided on either on an
application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration, a complete post office
address is missing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   Claims 118-142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kodosky et al. ("Kodosky", US #5,732,277) in view of http://www.uiml.org/ ("UIML"), and

further in view of Huang et al. ("Huang", US #6,968,539).

As per claim 118, although Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus

comprising a library for storing a plurality of filters and a processor for processing a

computer program stored on a computer-readable storage medium wherein the

processor executes, by processing the computer program, the step of selecting and

loading a plurality of desired filters from the library based on a user instruction (fig. 7;

col. 9, lines 32-43; *depicted are library of components that can be selected*),

editing/correcting interface control objects by using the plurality of desired filters,

wherein the plurality of desired filters are arranged in a sequence based on the user

instruction wherein the plurality of desired filters are arranged in a sequence based on

the user instruction and are associated with a set of UI control objects , each UI control

object characterizing a display of a corresponding filter (fig. 22; col. 16, line 61 through

col. 17, line 41; *illustrated are the established wiring blocks selected by the user, which*

represent dependency of adjacent filters) and generating display data for displaying

information of the plurality of desired filters in a display apparatus by interpreting the

edited/corrected user interface control objects and parsing of the code (fig. 22; *wherein*

parsing of the code is inherent in order to create the graphical representation), Kodosky

does not explicitly disclose the objects written in a markup language. UIML teaches UI

objects written in a markup language (pages 1-2). It would have been obvious to an

artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of UIML with the method of

Kodosky so that the process model is 1) human readable, and 2) compatible across

systems, i.e. independent of underlying binary represented scheme. Kodosky and UIML

still do not explicitly disclose the accessing step for accessing a code, i.e. accessing a

code written in a markup language. Huang teaches such accessing step for accessing a code (fig. 11; col. 3, lines 31-47; wherein configuration is a form of coding aka descriptive programming). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Huang with the method of Kodosky and UIML given that XML is readable both by machine and human and is a robust language widely applicable in many areas.

As per claim 119, the modified Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus wherein, in the correcting step, the processor adds codes of the plurality of desired filters to the user interface control objects in the arranged sequence (Kodosky: Abstract; fig. 22; *each element has an interface component device represented graphically wherein the user interface control provides logic for displaying*).

As per claim 120, the modified Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus wherein, in the correcting step, the processor changes the codes of a previously added filter when the processor adds the codes of the plurality of desired fitters to the user interface control objects (Kodosky: Abstract; fig. 22; *editing the code*).

As per claim 121, the modified Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus wherein the information of the plurality of desired filters is displayed based on the arranged sequence when the display data is outputted to the display apparatus (Kodosky: fig. 22; col. 16, line 61 through col. 17, line 41).

As per claim 122-124, although the modified Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus wherein the component of the user interface control object corresponding to at least one of the processing elements defines code for a graphical users interface

(Kodosky: fig. 57; *the function/filter, e.g. panel wherein the panel is a GUI customized*

for taking measurements, can generate interface components; as best as can be

determined, the reference teaches setting a display, i.e. establish a display, and since it

produces a display, it is interpreted to be setting), the modified Kodosky does not

explicitly disclose enabling the respective window to display buttons, toolbars and data

which is input, such as entering text, via the user interface to the processing element.

Official notice is taken that text and toolbars are standard in modern graphical user

interfaces. Moreover, text and toolbars are standard components of the user interface

so any modern system that generates a user interface as taught by the modified

Kodosky would be expected by an artisan at the time of the invention to generate those

standard components to enter data.

As per claims 125, 127 and 128, although the modified Kodosky teaches a data

processing apparatus comprising a plurality of desired filters from the library based on a

user instruction (Kodosky: fig. 7; col. 9, lines 32-43, the modified Kodosky does not

explicitly disclose the filter being one of a filter for search data based on a search target

inputted by a user, a printer filter for outputting appropriate data for a printer based on a

functionality of a printer and a help filter for providing help information. Official Notice is

taken that it is well known in the art that software components or subroutines, which are

equivalent to a filter, are commonly used to provide search data based on a search

target inputted by a user, outputting appropriate data for a printer based on a

functionality of a printer and a help information capabilities in software applications. It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the

method of search, print and help capabilities in software applications with the method of

the modified Kodosky in order to save time.

As per claim 126, the modified Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus

wherein the plurality of desired filters includes a display filter for displaying input data on

the data display area (Kodosky: Abstract; figs. 22 and 57).

As per claim 129, the modified Kodosky teaches a data processing apparatus

wherein the markup language is XML (UIML: page 1).

Claims 130 and 142 are individually similar in scope to claim 118 and are

therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 131 is similar in scope to claim 119 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 132 is similar in scope to claim 120 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 133 is similar in scope to claim 121 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claims 134-136 in combination are similar in scope to the combination of claims

122-124 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 137, 139 and 140 in combination are similar in scope to the combination

of claims 125, 127 and 128 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 138 is similar in scope to claim 126 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 141 is similar in scope to claim 129 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 118, 130 and 142 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571)
272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to
3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached at (571) 272-3923.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LVN
Patent Examiner
January 18, 2008

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174